## Remarks

Claims 1-11 and 13-29 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 10, 17. 27, 28 are amended, and claims 15, and 24-25 are cancelled without prejudice. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

## Claim Rejections- § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-19, and 21-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0002521 to <u>Traversat</u>, as set forth by pages 2-11 and 13-14 of the Final Office Action.

Claim 10 has been amended to essentially recite "downloading a search form to the seeker device", "manually entering data into at least one of the search fields by a user of the seeker device", "performing a search by the seeker device on the P2P network to determine identity files that include the manually entered data" and "determining collaborators for a collaboration session from the potential collaborators on the P2P network that correspond to the determined identity files". Claims 1, 10, and 28 have been amended in a similar fashion. It is believed that these amendments do not raise new issues because they essentially incorporate material from cancelled claims 15 and 25, which were already examined.

The Examiner contends that a discussion of an exchange of advertisement documents between peers in paragraphs [0169-0179] in <u>Traversat</u> discloses downloading a search form to the seeker device.

However, the advertisement documents exchanged between peers in <u>Traversat</u> are pre-defined XML documents. <u>Traversat</u> does not disclose a peer making manual changes to advertisement document received from another peer. Contrary to the claimed search form, the advertisement documents of Traversat do not enable dynamic entry of data, and

thus do not enable dynamic construction of a group of collaborators based on the dynamically entered data. Further, no facility is provided in <u>Traversat</u> to enable a user to enter or alter this data. Contrary to <u>Traversat</u>, Applicant's disclosure provides a facility (e.g., a search form) to enable manual entry of data into corresponding search fields (see also the graphical window provided in figure 6(c), which includes editable text fields). In this way, contrary to <u>Traversat</u>, a group of collaborators can be established in a dynamic fashion based on the data manually entered into the search form.

It is further submitted that <u>Traversat</u> does not disclose "performing a search by the seeker device on the P2P network to determine identity files having filenames that include data for at least one of the search fields" and "determining the collaborators that correspond to the <u>determined</u> identity files", as recited in amended claim 17. It is believed that the amendment does not raise new issues because it essentially incorporates material from cancelled claim 24, which was already examined.

The Examiner contends that narrowing a search by searching only the identity files whose filenames include data for at least one of the search fields is disclosed by paragraphs 22 and 147 of <u>Traversat</u>.

Paragraph 22 of <u>Traversat</u> merely discusses searching for files on file sharing systems such as Napster. However, unlike the identity files recited in claim 17, <u>Traversat</u> does <u>not</u> suggest that the files searched for are associated with collaborators. For example, there is no disclosure in <u>Traversat</u> that the files searched for by Napster include one or more search fields, let alone that the filenames of the files include data for at least one of these search fields. Paragraph 147 of <u>Traversat</u> merely discusses searching for services, but <u>not</u> narrowing a search of identity files having filenames that include search fields of those identity files.

Claim 14 is believed to be patentable over <u>Traversat</u> for at least similar reasons. For example, claim 14 recites, "narrowing the search by searching only the identity files whose filenames include data for at least one of the search fields".

It is further submitted that <u>Traversat</u> does not disclose "wherein the identity files are stored as one of an XML file on a P2P shared directory on one of the determined collaborators or on a distributed Hash Table on the P2P network", as recited in amended claim 27. It is believed that the amendment does not raise new issues because it essentially incorporates material from claim 29, which was already examined.

The Examiner contends that paragraphs 169-179 of <u>Traversat</u> disclose *each* identity file is stored as one of an XML file on a P2P shared directory on a potential collaborator or on a distributed Hash Table on the P2P network.

Paragraphs 169-179 merely discuss the advertisement documents. However, contrary to claim 27, there is no mention in paragraphs 169-179 of storing the advertisement documents in a P2P shared directory or a Hash Table. Further, there is no mention elsewhere in <u>Traversat</u> of the storage of files of any kind on one of a P2P shared directory or a Hash Table on the P2P network.

Claim 29 is believed to be patentable over <u>Traversat</u> for at least similar reasons. For example, claim 29 recites, "each identity file is stored as one of an XML file on a P2P shared directory on a potential collaborator or on a distributed Hash Table on the P2P network".

For at least the foregoing reasons, <u>Traversat</u> fails to disclose claims 1, 10, 14, 17, 27, 28, and 29. Thus, claims 1, 10, 14, 17, 27, 28, and 29 are believed to be patentable over <u>Traversat</u>.

Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11, 13-14, 16-19, 21-23, 26, and 29 are believed to be patentable at least by virtue of their dependence to their respective base claims.

Withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

## Claim Rejections- § 103

Claims 5 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <a href="Traversat">Traversat</a>, in view of U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0217140 to <a href="Burbeck">Burbeck</a>, as set forth by pages 13-14 of the Office Action.

The above 103 rejection is premised, in part, on the Examiner's reliance on <a href="Traversat"><u>Traversat</u></a> as disclosing all elements of claims 1 and 17, where claim 5 depends from claim 1 and claim 20 depends from claim 17.

However, <u>Traversat</u> does not disclose all the elements of claims 1 and 17 for the reasons discussed above. For example, <u>Traversat</u> does not disclose downloading of a search form to a seeker device, a user of the seeker device manually entering data into one or more fields of the search form, the seeker device searching identity files for the manually entered data to determine end-user devices or collaborators, and the seeker device initiating a collaboration between the determined end-user devices or collaborators, as essentially recited in claim 1.

Further, <u>Traversat</u> does not disclose performing a search by the seeker device on the P2P network to determine identity files having filenames that include data for at least one of the search fields and determining the collaborators that correspond to the determined identity files, as recited in claim 17.

Further the deficiencies of <u>Traversat</u> in this regard are not cured by <u>Burbeck</u>. For example, Burbeck is merely concerned with (e.g., in paragraph 20) the persisting of a

node's reputation in a network having transient network communities, but makes no

mention of a user of a seeker device manually entering data into one or more fields of a

downloaded search form to determine end-user devices or collaborators, makes no

mention of determining identity files having filenames that include data for at least one

the search field, and makes no mention of storage of identity files as one of an XML file

on a P2P shared directory on a collaborator or on a distributed Hash Table on a P2P

network.

Accordingly, the combination of <u>Traversat</u> and <u>Burbeck</u> cannot render obvious

claims 5 and 20.

**Conclusion** 

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims

now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable

reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By:

Donald B. Paschburg

Reg. No. 33,753

Attorney for Applicant

**Correspondence Address:** 

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department

170 Wood Avenue South

Iselin, New Jersey 08830

(732) 321-3191

-12-